DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 105 HE 015 434

AUTHOR Hoffnung, Robert J.
TITLE Form as the Hidden Curriculum in College Teaching.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; College Environment; College Faculty; College Instruction; College Students; Developmental Psychology; *Educational Change; Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; *Power Structure; Social Behavior; Social Exchange Theory; Student Attitudes; Student College Relationship; *Student Development; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The view of education as a liberating, enlightening, individuating process and educational approaches to support this goal are examined. According to Ivan Illich (1970), the social relations within the educational encounter have corresponded closely to the social relations of dominance, subordination, and motivation in the economic sphere. He calls this type of educational encounter the "hidden curriculum." It is suggested that unless explicitly examined and confronted, the formal aspects of classroom teaching function as a hidden curriculum that stands in opposition to the personal development and individuation of both students and teachers, and this situation also severely limits the teaching situation. It is proposed that teachers must come to expect that students are capable of being active, self-aware participants, subjects and objects of study, recipients and providers of knowledge, and creators of new understandings of the human condition. Classroom experiences at the University of Cincinnati, Yale University, and the University of New Haven are cited as illustrations of this point of view. The reasons why participants select a course and their expectations can serve as the historical context and the starting point for confronting the hidden curriculum. In the teaching of developmental psychology, the developmental life history of the student can serve as the stimulus for exploring the concepts of the course and dialogue. The role of small support groups and the issues of curriculum, texts, and grades are addressed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222105

Form As The Hidden Curriculum In College Teaching

Robert J. Hoffnung

University of New Haven

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Hoffnung

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Although expression of dissatisfaction with the college classroom is currently muted and organized attempts to improve education less evident than in the late 1960's and early 1970's, many of the symptoms and underlying problems still prevail. Students seem to lack self discipline, to be poorly motivated, and inadequately prepared. They appear passive and uncritical, rarely challenging the premises and content of what is taught, or rejecting it out of hand on mainly emotional grounds. Faculty find it difficult to maintain standards of competence and excellence and worry about grade inflation, shrinkage in depth and breadth of coverage, and even illiteracy. Many seem burnt-out and alienated from their students and their work, with expectations of intellectual challenge and personal development giving way to lesser hopes from classroom teaching.

Although the Viet Nam War has ended, the social problems of corporate America here and abroad have worsened. Life in the University has not fared much better, with the questions of whose University, governed by whom, serving whom, to what ends still largely unresolved.

Innovations in classroom teaching have continued on a limited basis, with even more limited success. A brief sampling of the

journal entitled Teaching of Psychology, published by Division Two of the American Psychological Associated gives some indication of the nature of these efforts in the field of Psychology. A number of articles report on strategies or tactics of classroom management geared to manipulate student attitudes, motivation , and performance. Others deal with a range of more humanistic, student centered techniques which include the teacher as actor-performer, various personalized instruction approaches, group methods, student centered journals, self modification, field work, case study, minicourses, student TAs, and contract option grading. Rarely do these reports identify an underlying set of problems or relate their particular techniques to a broader strategy of educational change. While many authors note that limitations of time, resources, program requirements, class size, student characteristics, etc. seriously interferred with their attempts at innovation and change, and mitigate hopes for permanantly instituting changes which were successful, almost all of them take the formal aspects of classroom teaching as givens.

While changes in teaching technique and course content are not irrelevant to educational improvement, it is within the formal administrative procedures of the classroom that the problem is rooted. These formal aspects include grading, testing, program requirements, syllibi, attendance, and the competitive, authoritarian, hierarichical social relations of the educational encounter. They serve to reproduce the class-hierarchical productive and psycho-social relations which characterize corporate America. This formulation is not a new one. Bowles and Gintis (1976), for example, have traced the historical development of schooling and conclude that schools serve to legitimate society through "...the fostoring of a generalized consciousness among individuals which prevents the formation of the social bonds and critical understanding whereby existing social conditions might be transformed."

They go on to describe the process which Ivan Illich (1970) has labelled the "hidden curriculum." "The heart of the process of legitimation is to be found not in the content of the educational encounter or the process of information transfer, but in the form: the social relations of the educational encounter. These correspond closely to the social relations of dominance, subordination, and motivation in the economic sphere. Through the educational encounter individuals are induced to accept the degree of powerlessness with which they will be faced as mature workers." Jeanne Binstock(1970) investigated the different patterns of social relations in higher education. She reports that major variations of college experiences are linked to basic psychological differences in work perception and aspiration among the major social class (occupational) groups who attend. She found that institutions that enroll working-class students are oriented to preparing them for lower-level jobs in the production hierarchy and emphasize followership and behavioral methods of control, while the more elite schools tend to staff higher-level jobs and emphasize leadership and motivational, self-directive control in their educational approach. Such authors as Henry Giroux and Anthony Penna (1977)& Stanley Aronowitz (1973) draw similar conclusions about how schools socialize children into relationships of domination-subordination and powerlessness through the hierarchical administration-teacher-student structure, and through age grading &tracking.

The Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1973), and such critical social theorists as Jurgen Habermas (1970) and Herbert Marcuse (1964), have detailed the ways in which human development and the growth of critical consciousness are thwarted by conditions of domination. Freire (1973) suggests that mainstream education is analogous to banking. Teachers are the depositors, students the depositories.

Teachers are the narrating subject and students the passive, patient, listening, objects. Knowledge comes to be viewed as a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgable upon those whom they consider to know little or nothing. The teacher presents him/herself to the students as their necessary opposite: by considering their ignorance absolute, the teachers own existence is justified.

Freire asserts that education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction. The true teacher's thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the student's thinking. He calls for a dialectical, problem-posing education involving praxis - the action and reflection of people upon their world in order to transform it. One in which human beings are active makers of history, including their own. Problem-posing education involves critical dialogue among participants who become jointly responsible for the process in which they develop. Arguments based on the arbitrary authority of age, credential, rank, etc are no longer valid. The educational process develops through the discovery and exploration of what he calls the "generative themes" in the lives of the participants. Generative themes are those which are most central to recognizing and understanding ones current and potential activities as a conscious agent in the world. In a sense, they reflect the key or primary contradictions and conflicts in people's lives. He suggest that broader societal or epochal themes are also present. The fundamental theme of our epoch, domination, implies its opp site, liberation, as the goal or objective to be achieved. Generative themes both contain and are contained in "limit situations", the set of problems and impediments which people encounter in understanding and acting upon their life situations. As in the case of the "hidden curriculum",

lack of a clear understanding of the factors which prevent our development makes change difficult.

On a more microcosmic level, to investigate the generative theme is to investigate one's thinking about reality and ones actions in shaping it. This process is called praxis. Praxis is active, existential and historical. The very process implies transformation. Freire suggests that the absence of a concrete expression of generative themes does not imply their nonexistence. Rather , it suggests the active presence of the dominant theme of silence, which is typically evidenced in the face of the overwhelming force of the limit situation of domination.

While in the 1960's and early 1970's the basics of the above analysis were accepted by a significant number of students and faculty, extension and deepening of that critique and building of a movement to radically alter education has not been strongly in evidence in the late 1970's. It is not that the beginnings of that critique were incorrect or that the problems addressed have been resolved. Rather, it is because we are faced with the difficult task of developing a deeper, more careful analysis during a period when opposition to such an effort is more intense and more sophisticated than ever before, and where support for such a project is hard to build or to recognize when it is present.

Unless explicitly examined and confronted, the formal aspects of classroom teaching function as a "hidden curriculum" which stands in opposition to the personal development and individuation of both students and teachers, and which severely limits the teaching situation despite our creative and well-intentioned efforts to improve it. Acceptance of the argument that the formal aspects of the classroom situation reproduce oppressive and unjust social relations, bring students, teachers, and administrators alike into conflict with a

set of limit situations which are difficult to accept and even more difficult to alter. I think that this is particularly the case for those of us whose professional (and perhaps personal) lives are grounded in the paradigms and ideologies of "mainstream psychology " (Braginsky & Braginsky, 1974). Adherence to the ideology of behaviorism and scientific objectivism which is so dominant in our field, invites the invention and application of behavior modification technologies to the task of social control, be it in hospitals, prisons and other total institutions, or in workplaces, families, or college classrooms. Acceptance of the premises of mainstream psychology, makes it difficult to conceive of our students (or ourselves) as being capable of being active agents in our own mutual development: of being capable of praxis. As Mischler (1976) has suggested, Skinnerism at its best, be it hard line or soft, is at odds with a dialectical view of the world.

Confronting the Hidden Curriculum

Significant change in the college classroom is unlikely to occur unless the above conflict is recognized and afforded a central role as a legitimate content of classroom activity. While the classroom situation by no means circumscribes all of the important themes in the lives of its participants, many of the central issues and conflicts are present in microcosm. As Freire has suggested, the theme of passivity may well play the dominant role. It is a theme which often incorporates authoritarianism, hiearchy, competitive individualism and resistance to change, all of which fit hand-in-glove with the form of the hidden curriculum.

It seems reasonable that educators should be expected to bring the knowledge of their field to bear on their classroom practice, and that our experiences in our classrooms should inform our theoretical work. I am not suggesting our problem can be solved by giving psychology away, a task which itself is by no means very

easy. I say this because psychology - its ideological assumptions and empirical contents - are a gift horse that must be looked in the mouth. The Braginskys (1974), Mischler (1976), Riegel (1978), Scheibe (1978), among others, are engaged in this task, but it is only a beginning. In classroom teaching, the formal expectation that a specified curriculum and text will be covered, within a pre-specified period of time, with a captive audience, whose performance will be competitively ranked, creates a situation where the very gift horse that is being scrutinized must also serve as our mount. We face the task of teaching our students the "normal science" of our field while simultaneously joining with them to develop a critique which calls in to question both its reliability and internal consistency and its validity for understanding and bettering the human condition in a very real and difficult world. We face a similar challenge in attempting to successfully maintain the tension between the expectations which students and teachers alike hold based upon years of experience with affirmative, passive, authoritarian, hierarchical education and the possibilities of an educational process in which they are negative, active, democratic critical co-participants.

A break with the past requires that teachers discover in our classroom activity and in our professional and private lives these liberating potentials, and model their possibility in our teaching. We must come to expect that our students (and ourselves) are capable of being active, self-aware participants, subjects and objects of study, recipients and providers of knowledge, and creators of new understandings of the human condition.

I came to college teaching strongly committed to the University as a place of personal and social change and a place where the limitations and oppressions of our society could and would be critically confronted. I also came with an awareness that the University is and has always been

contained the conflicting tendencies of stasis versus change, of reaction versus progress, of affirmation and reproduction versus negation and critique. It is a mixed bag. While the theory and practice of University hav e provided a climate in which critique and human development are at times possible, it has also been and continues to be an institutional bulwark of much of what is wrong with our society.

Having said this, I will add that my awareness of these conflicts has been sharpened considerably during my 10 years of teaching. That my belief in the University as a locus of critique and progressive social change rather than ideological rationalization and stasis has not changed. That teaching with these expectations has been both difficult and rewarding, and continues to be both.

The classroom experience upon which I will draw includes lower and upper level undergraduate courses and graduate courses at the University of Cincinnati, Yale University and the University of New Haven. Having taught at "elite" and "less elite" institutions, I am aware of important differences in goals, methods and constituencies that exist. While the more elite institutions continue to prepare the future rulers and managers of our society, less elite institutions serve to prepare the work force that they will manage. In fact the recent massification of higher education and the decline in meaningful work have led to a situation where working class and community colleges andreasingly provide para-credentials and extended "socio-education" for a large number of individuals who will continue to fill the same level jobs that high school diplomas certified them for not very long ago. Despite these differences, however, both elite and less-elite institutions of higher learning prepare their students to accept and participate in the hiearchical social order, the former for positions

of leadership, the latter for followership. In both, the formal, administrative aspects of classroom teaching and the hidden curriculum have pervasive influence on the educational process.

Historical Context in Classroom Teaching

The historical context within which participants meet in a given room at a given time for a given course provides one important starting point for confronting the hidden curriculum. I use this notion very broadly in that it potentially includes a very wide range of questions and issues, such as : How did you come to take/teach this course? What are your immediate and long term expections? How come? Where does the course fit in with the current context of your life? With your experiences to date with the field of psychology? With education? At the same time, I am using the notion of historical in a rather narrow way, in that the classroom is micro-rather than macro-cosmic in its scope. But to the extent that the classroom situation is organically and reproductively related to the broader societal-historical context, careful, critical investigation of its limit situations and generative themes hold the potential of transforming the micro-scopic exploration of the classroom into a tele-scopic exloration of society and the human condition.

Over the years, many of the discussions of these "opening day" questions have to passive, nonresponsive dead-ends, ie,, "I don't know"or"that's up to you, the professor", or, to questions concerning course requirements and other formal aspects of the classroom situation, rather than content . How will you grade? Do you count attendance? How much (rarely what) do we have to read? What kind of tests? How many? Papers? How long? What about lateness, extra credit, class presentations? Each semester I struggle with "opening day" and over the years have explored explored a variety of approaches ranging from authoritatively

laying out a clear and unambiguous course outline, list of assignments, testing and grading procedure, etc. to sitting (generally unnoticed) among the students, waiting with them for the professor to arrive and working from there. While the former approach has never proven very satisfactory, the later has had serious limitations as well. It is not a sense of successful technique that I wish to emphasize, but rather an approach or orientation to the classroom which is consistant with the goals presented earlier in this paper.

Life History and Educational Dialogue

Although "opening day" questions about the formal aspects of the classroom situation and the historical context of a class meeting have sometimes led to productive dialogue, these questions have more frequently eleicited the theme of silence. There are many possible starting points for productive dialogue, by which I mean dialogue which supports the development and exploration of generative themes in the lives of the participants. In the discussion which follows, I will give some examples of this in my own teaching.

In the teaching of the Psychology of Human Development (more typically called Developmental Psychology) the developmental life history has considerable potential for dialogue which is productive of generative themes. It sanctions each participant to take their own life as a point of departure from which to explore the central themes and limit situations which they experience. The very process of making ihe lives of the participants a major focus of educational activity validates our lives as the very stuff that the history of human development is made of and confronts many of the limits which the formal aspects of the classroom impose. Writing about ones own life can be threatening, however, largely because we grow up in a society which encourages self-absorbtion and subjectivity as long as it is individualistic and a-historical . We live in an epoch where

history is written about, by and for the powerful, the famous, and the unusual. The history of most human beings goes largely unrecorded and unrecognized. Jesse Lemisch (1967) has referred to this unrecorded history of the great majority of people who produce our goods, raise our food and our children, fight our wars, etc., as the "history of the inarticulate."

Self-history through autobiography is also difficult because it threatens to reveal to us the disparities between what we need and want and what we have the power to achieve, and our vulnerability to the actions of those who have the power and authority to make decisions which affect our lives. Discussions of these difficulties almost always has led to exploration of the validity of taking the lives of the participants as an important starting point for studying psychological development. Questions concerning the role of subjectvity (isn't science objective and unbiased?), credentials (isn't the teacher always right?), as well as various manifestations of the hidden curriculum (How do you grade someone's life? How long should it be? Can self-revelation be required? Who should it be written for? Who should read it?) readily emerge from the task. Space is created to confront the theoretical, ideological, and empirical contents of the field from a position of active subjects rather than as passive objects. From a position which emphasizes strength rather than weakness.

At its best, the process can lead to the development of a shared or collective sense of developmental history for the class as a whole, in active tension with the development of individual histories. The process can also lead to exploration of the similarities and differences between the lives of the participants and the lives of other individuals and groups within our society and without, contemporary and past. While microcosmic in some respects. the small sample of

participants in the classroom is far from representative of the total human experience. This realization - that the participatns within a given classroom are both a microcosm of the themes and history of human development and a highly limited and unrepresentative sample of all of the current, past and future realities and possibilities of human beings does not easily emerge. I have found that consciousness of the impact of family, sex, socio-economics, culture, work, etc. are often not directly available to participants. Contemporary society lauds individualism and separateteness as the essence of full humanity while at the same time denying that any important systematic differences exist in the opportunities for development available. In an atmosphere where the relationships between personal similarities and differences and broader social forces can be explored, understandings can and often do emerge.

A similar approach has been reported by a group of teachers at Brown University (Giroux and Penna, 1977) who teach literature. Adopting the position that social relations in the classroom can be best understood in terms of a "hidden curriculum", they take as a starting point for their classes what they call "the Fundamental Essay". The Fundamental Essay focuses on the student's critical exploration of their own literary taste, through an analysis of the relationship between their own experience and background (economic, political, cultural, etc.) and the model of the world proposed in the work of literature being studied. The essay is written as an open letter to all of the participants in the class. The work of the course involves an ongoing process of comparing, evaluating and refining . Grading is pass-fail for the course, and they voice doubts that their approach would be possible otherwise. The developmental life-histories I have described are not graded either, for the same obvious reasons, although a reasonable level of involvement

and productivity are expected.

A related direction that has proven fruitful has been the use of interviews with one another, family members, and with people who students engage for the first time in order to find out about the lives of others. Reading biographical and autobiographical accounts of people's lives and observing and participating in field work in daycares, schools, work places, neighborhoods, etc. have also been logical extensions of the developmental self-history approach. I again wish to emphasize that isolated from their context, any of these activities can be easily viewed as merely techniques for making classes more interesting and relevant. But as techniques which are bounded and interpenetrated by the formal aspects of the classroom and the social relations (hidden curriculum) which they help to maintain, they too easily become co-opted and assimilated into the very process they are relied upon to escape. To the extent that these activities emerge as part of a struggle to expose and critically oppose the hidden curriculum as it influences the lives of the classroom participants, these activities can serve as a form for the development of critical consciousness.

Support Groups

Small groups have been a mainstay technique for educational reformers. However it is not as an organizational technique,but rather as an expression of the theme of self conscious collective activity that groups have proven fruitful of critical dialogue in my teaching experience. People generally enter the classroom as isolated, disconnected individuals, and frequently exit much the same. I am not suggesting that regular class participation with a group of people three times per week for fifteen weeks does not create friendships and some degree of connectedness. In my experience, however, the hierarchical teacher-student relationship,

student expectations of passive-receptive learning, program requirements, syllibi, competitive grading and other formal, administrative expressions of the hidden curriculum have strongly inhibited and severely limited the possibilities for friendship and collectivity. In a teacher-centered classroom, cooperative efforts pose a potential threat to teacher authority. Cooperation stands in contradiction to student competition for grades, where one individual's success is anothers failure and where grades (and their promise of future monetary reward) and social rewards are externally controlled. In fact, the development and application of a varied body of managerial-manipulative techniques aimed at managing or modifying conflictful or otherwise undesirable student behavior constitutes a major area of theory and research for the many in our field who believe that human beings <u>are</u> their behavior and that the modification, control and shaping of student behavior is the goal of education.

The discovery of generative themes and the struggle to define and overcome the past and current experiences and conditions which stand between human beings and their possibilities is to my mind, the central theme of education which is most endangered by the goals of training in technique and social skills required for societal reproduction.

While there is considerable evidence to support a view that human beings are inherently social by virtue of their evolutionary history (e.g. Montagu, 1970 ; 1972) the work of such psychologists as Shapira & Madsen,1969;Milgram,1974; Sherif,1958), among others, strongly indicates that while the powerful influence of groups on people's lives are indisputable, there influences can vary widely in terms of the well being of the participants.

I have found that both on the classroom-wide level and on the sub-group level involving smaller groupings within the classroom

that the central issue is the degree to which groups are mutually self-determined by the participants, rather than arbitrarily imposed by the teacher. Groups which are generated from the work of the participants who self-select their membership and self-direct their activity, serve them well. The tasks of such groups have included study, projects, field work, class presentations, etc. Ideally, self-selection is based upon mutually recognized interests, needs, perspectives, problems, etc., and the process furthers mutual development of the participants. Many of the important generative themes are most easily located in collective experience and in the process of experiencing/discovering oneself in the same problem situations as others. There is great potential strength in simultaneously discovering that while many of ones beliefs and understandings and experiences are shared, others are not. The shared, symmetrical basis of self-selected, self-directed groups provides a potential basis to enter into dialogue about similarities, differences and their implications.

The situation of the classroom and the histories of the participants make the emergence of self-determined groups difficult. For most people, experiences with self-generated, self-directed groups has been very limited or non-existent, while experience with externally established and directed groups has been the norm. It is the exception, rather than the rule that we self determine the make up or activities of our families, school groups, work groups, religious groups, etc. While our voluntary associations and activities do provide some counterpoint for the above, in many cases closer scrutiny indicates that their voluntary nature is often strongly limited by formal and informal rules and expectations which tend to parallel the more formal groupings mentioned above. In any case, many if not most of the students whom I encounter are very wary of committing themselves to active participation in collective activity. Leadership is both mistrusted and held

in awe. It tends to viewed as something that is static and unchanging. As limited to a chosen few, rather than as a set of potentials in every person which can be fostored or inhibited depending upon the context. My guess is that it is not merely lack of experience with self-determined groups that is the issue, but more likely considerable experience with"getting burned" as a result of trusting the promise of self-determination and mutual development in situations where the goods were not delivered. Senett and Cobb (1972) speak eloquently of the hidden injuries of class and the process of self-alienation in the classrcom and at the workplace which through its manifest passivity and unwillingness to get involved protect the participant from worse harm. Lillian Rubin (1976) describes how working class families use similar strategies to deal with their "worlds of pain."

In most classrooms, the teacher embodies in ways both symbolic and actual, those with the power to subvert or prevent student efforts to self-determine. I tend to agree with the notion that it is often the most rigid and authoritarian teachers who are least confusing about the matter, but also suspect that their approach to teaching holds little promise for solving the problems developed above. More confusing to students, I think, are faculty who have internalized the critique enough to try to improve the situation, but who are unwilling to accept responsibility for the changes in themeselves and in the hidden curriculum of the classroom that all this implies.

To my mind, the leadership of the teacher is central to whether or not the progressive potential of groups can be realized. The teacher must make as clear as possible his/her philosophy and expectations with regard to the form and content of classroom activity. A clear understanding of our roles as teachers can only emerge out of a willingness to engage in a conflictful process which at the same time conserves and rejects the values and activities of our profession and of the

University. In trying to confront the hidden curriculum in ourselves and in the classroom and afford it a central role in the educational process we are faced with the problem of sucessfully maintaining and developing the tension between meeting current needs and expectations of the participants as shaped by their pasts, while at the same time responding to evolving needs and expectations as shaped by current activity and emerging awareness of future possibilities. I have rarely found it easy, often difficult, and at times impossible to work as an educator within the constraints of the formal aspects of teaching.

Curriculum, Texts and Grades

I suspect that there are those among you who are saying to yourselves: O.K., sounds interesting, but what about the bottom line. What do his classes cover ? Does he use a text? How does he evaluate what is learned and how his students fair compared to others?

With regard to curriculum, the critical/dialogical approach that I attempt to work with generally brings the students in my classes into meaningful contact with most of what I consider meaningful in "Normal, Mainstream Psychology"(Braginsky & Braginsky, 1974), as well as some degree of contact with the rest of the field. I generally have used what appeared to be the least of the current evils in texts. As the repository of the current body of mainstream psychology it provides one important starting point for a critical understanding of the field. Other points of departure and counterpoints come from paperbacks, articles, lectures, and, very importantly, the past and current ideas and experiences of teacher and students, academic and non-academic. As a result, there are a number of potential "curricula", and while my agenda concerning which topics, areas and issues out of the many might be encountered in a course, the particular group of

students who I find myself with and the process of developing a dialogue between us, among us and with the ideas and findings of the field generate our own learning history, which in retrospect could be reconstructed and labelled a curriculum. I am convinced that participants in my classes have a superior educational experience. I suspect that their recall of mainstream facts, principles and jargon is as good as that of students next door , and have little doubt that their understanding of psychology in terms of their own lives and in societal context is much better.

In my experience, the issue of grades has been one of the most difficult to deal with. Grading by some quantitative measure of performance and using the "objective" outcomes to differentially allocate limited resources (high grades) which at least in theory represent vouchers which will be redeemable for a greater or lesser portion of the "good life" at some future time is a bulwark of the hidden curriculum and stands in towering opposition to dialogical education. I distinguish between grading and evaluation. Evaluation, as I understand it, is more generic and refers to the myriad ways in which people can learn about how they are doing at something, how they are coming along, how they are developing. Evaluation need not be a problem, Any group of people who are concerned about each others progress, can figure out a way to evaluate it. As a psychologist and an educator I take an active role in helping my students evaluate their progress. Large classes, the rigidity of the fifteen week semester, the 50 minute hour, the one shot course system, and competing pressures of student (and at times faculty) lives outside my classroom makes thorough and useful evaluation difficult at times. Responsive evaluation for 12 students is a lot of work, but managable, individually responsive evaluation for 100 or more students with a four course/semester teaching load is close to impossible.

Grading is a special type of evaluation. Grading results when evaluation is isolated from the context in which the activity occurs and when control over the process and its implications is denied to those being judged. Invariably, grading of human activity serves as a mechanism of actual or potential social control. In the college classroom it reaffirms the administrative role of the teacher who is assigned the task of reproducing class differences through tracking. To keep my job I am constrained to grade. To enhance their chances of getting a job- a good job...a better job, of getting into graduate/ professional training at some future time, students are generally interested in getting graded. Past dependence upon grades and a belief that grading constitutes the only valid measure of educational progress, make it difficult for many to pursue learning in the college classroom without clearly articulated extrinsically controlled rewards. To the extent that participants in the educational process assume an active role in understanding and evaluating their own development, the possibility of increased critical consciousness is enhanced and the aims of the hidden curriculum are subverted.

I do not have a satisfactory solution to the problem of grading, short of abolishing it, so that constructive evaluation can flourish. During the late 60's and early 70's, students at a number of universities successfully confronted this issue, winning ungraded or pass-fail evaluation in some or all of their courses. Most of these successes were achieved at elite institutions. Few non-graded or pass-fail curricula currently exist. In my teaching the use of a pass-fail contract system, with satisfactory completion of contracted-for-work at A, B or C levels resulting in the agreed upon grade has sometimes improved the situation , especially with larger classes. For smaller classes, individualized programs with evaluation conferences have at times seemed fruitful. In many cases, students can maintain a substantive

record of their progress/development during the course of the term, and such a record can serve as one basis for a mutually arrived at evaluation by student and teacher. So long as translation of evaluations into the competitive hierarchy of grades is required, the hidden curriculum retains its major strangle hold. It is rarely possible to maintain a successful developmental tension between grading and evaluation, but it is when critical exploration of this tension becomes one of the contents of the classroom, that critical consciousness is most likely to emerge. In a sense, confrontation with the domination of grading implies confrontation with the hidden curriculum and with the societal domination that it tends to perpetuate, and holds out the possibility of the negation of domination, liberation.

Other Sources of Resistance

The rapidly escalating trend for universities to be managed like factories and other corporate enterprises and the strong ideological-political committment of those who run them to reinforce and perpetuate the existing social order by training and socializing students who will successfully and passively adjust and accept their roles, does not give much cause for optimism. Through increasing hierarchical control over class size, scheduling, course oferings, requirements, libraries, textbook acquisition, xeroxing, and of course grading, the managers of the university make education for critical consciousness more and more difficult. I am not arguing that increasing costs and threats of declining enrollments present real challenges . What is in question, is who will be empowered to define the problem, determine the optimal solution strategy, and oversee its implementation and what educational values and goals and interests will inform those decisions.

What seems clear at this point, is that the dominant strategy as well as many of the tactics employed at present are based on assumption and goals which largely affirm the one dimensional corporate-capitalist

society in which we live, and on assumptions and goals which stand in opposition to education for critical consciousness.

It should also be noted, that while managers of the university are the main source of resistance to progressive educational change, they are not the only source. Considerable resistance comes from the faculty who administratively implement the decisions of university management through the hidden curriculum of their classroom teaching. Faculty are highly resistant to examining (or in some cases, re-examining) what they are doing and why. Some are very much in tune with the formal aspects of teaching and see themselves as doing students a service in preparing them to passively adjust and fit in. Others are unhappy with the conflict they feel in themselves and sense in their students, but in their attempts to innovate, focus on removing the symptoms by hook or crook, and fall short of examining their roles as implementors of the hidden curriculum. These faculty are generally well intentioned, and when confronted with this situation tend to defend themeselves by"blaming the victim", the 'passive', 'ill-prepared', unmotivated', 'inadequate' students for the failures of their best efforts to make the classroom a better place. Faculty find it difficult to entertain the po sibility that the very aspects of the teaching situation which they have come to identify with rigor, competence, discipline, quality education, and the like, and to which they are so strongly committed, are deeply impeded in and interpenetrated by the hierarchical, authoritarian, passive social relations which underly and reproduce the symptoms which distress them.

The powerlessness of competitive individualism palpably pervades the lives of university faculty. Collaborative teaching endeavers, interdisciplinary offerings, open classrooms, mutual self-criticism,

and non-exploitive collaboration with students tend to be the exception, even when managerial policy leaves some leeway for them to occur. My experience has been that while the need for more collective activity, unity, and critique of our situation is shared by some minority of faculty, we find it very difficult to create and protect the time and organizational forms required to act upon these needs.

I do not wish to end on a pessimistic note. While my realistic appraisal is that things will get worse rather than better, I believe that in the land of the blind , even one eye is extremely helpful. A dialogical approach which locates the development of critical consciousness at the center of the educational process, which takes the tradition of Marx, Freud, Marcuse,& Freire, to name only a few, as a point of departure, holds the potential for progressive change. The goal of education as a liberating, enlightening, individuating process must not be denied, for to do so is to do injustice to students, faculty, the university and society at large.

References

Aronowitz, Stanley. False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Working Class Consciousness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.

Binstock, Jeanne. "Survival in the American College Industry." Unpulbished PhD Dissertation, Brandeis University, 1970.

Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.

Braginsky, Benjamin and Braginsky, Dorothy. Mainstream Psychology: A Critique. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. ,1974.

Freire, Paulo. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Giroux, Henry and Penna, Anthony. Social Relations in the Classroom: The Dialectic of the Hidden Curriculum. Edcentric, 1977, 40-41 , 39-47.

Habermas, Jurgen. Toward a Rational Society:Student Protest, Science, and Politics. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Lemisch, Jesse. Towards a Democratic History. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Radical Education Project, 1967.

Marcuse, Herbert. One Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Milgram, Stanley. Obedience to Authority. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Mischler, Elliot. Skinnerism: Materialism Minus the Dialectic. Journal of Theory of Social Behavior, 1976, 6, (1), 21-47.

Montagu, Ashley. The Direction of Human Development. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1955.

Montagu, Ashley (Ed.) Culture and the Evolution of Man. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Riegel, Klaus. Psychology Mon Amour: A Countertext. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978 .

Rubin, Lillian Breslow. Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.

Scheibe, Karl. The Psychologist's Advantage and its Nullification: Limits of Human Predictability. American Psychologist, 1978 33, 869-881.

Sennett. R. and Cobb, J. The Hidden Injuries of Class. New York: Knopf, 1972.

Shapira, Ariella and Madsen, Millard. Cooperative and Competitive Behavior of Kibbutz and Urban Children in Israel. Child Development, 1969, 40, 609-617.

Sherif, Muzafer. The Psychology of Social Norms. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1936.